46-92

G R S IX-5]

Previous references.
1 – 18

1892-93

191 .

(Mun-al)

File No. 14-91

Serial Nos.

Later references.
51 - 52
49 - 50
45 - 48

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Major ~~Part~~ B for Decr 93.

SUBJECT.

Refund of the allowance drawn by Mr Amaidas as the Vice President of the Barcelore City Municipality

---

Rendered

W D 1250—GPB—30,000 - 28-1 19

1

Draft for

Pro of the Govt. of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read:-

Letter No. 642, L.F. dated 10th December 1892 - from the Comptroller in Mysore.

Order

No. 27

In the Proceedings of the Govt., No. 1515-16. / L.F. 46-92 dated 28th July 1892, it was directed that Mr. Annaji Rao, Assistant Commissioner should — forthwith refund the — amount drawn by him as allowance for doing the duties of Vice-President of the Bangalore city municipality from 16th December 1891 to 30th April 1892. The allowance so drawn amounts to Rs. 451-9-10

46-2-B-Fy 17-a-a 3

Her papers must go to H. H's Dewan - A Revenue officer behaving in this manner in this manner is sure to be dismissed.-

AB
7/9/93

On the 28th November/92 the Comptroller enquired of Mr. Annaji Rao whether he had refunded the amount in question and, if this had not been done, he requested him to deduct the same by short drawal from his pay. In reply, Mr. Annaji Rao stated on 2nd December that a reference for the reconsideration of the order for refund was pending before the Government and requested that in the meantime the order might be held in abeyance. He was informed on the same day

3/

day that as the orders of Government were peremptory his request could not be complied with. Mr. Annaji Rao answered on 3rd December that after addressing the Comptroller on the subject he had drawn his pay for November 1892 in full, but that he was prepared to refund the amount should the Government affirm their original decision. The Comptroller pointed out in reply that Mr. Annaji Rao's ~~had drawn~~ action in drawing his pay for November in full in opposition to the instructions given by him was irregular, ~~the Comptroller~~ ~~Office~~, and that the ordered refund should at

once be made under article 16, chapter I; Vol. I of the Civil Account Code 5. Edition.

4/

The Comptroller has now in his letter cited above, submitted for the orders of Government the irregularity of the action of Mr. Annaji Rao who, being himself the Officer in charge of the Bangalore District Treasury, failed to carry out the instructions given by the Comptroller in obedience to the orders of Government

In ~~going~~ going over the papers connected with this case, it appears to the Government that

that the Comptrollers Office itself was in the first instance dilatory in not having taken action upon the Proceedings of the 28th July till the 28th November 1892, and in not having pointed out to Mr. Annaji Rao the rate at which refund should be made, which under article 16 of the Civil Account Code above referred to is "ordinarily not to exceed one-third of salary." Further, the amount to be refunded in the present case viz. Rs. 451 odd, being more than Mr. Annaji Rao's salary which is only Rs. 250/- per mensem, it

was the more necessary
for the Comptroller to —
have indicated to Mr.
Annaji Rao the amount
of short drawal he
should make each month
from his pay.

On the other hand
the conduct of Mr. Annaji
Rao has throughout been
most reprehensible. Al-
-though the Comptroller
addressed him on the —
28th November, that is,
in sufficient time for
a portion at least —
of the refund being made
from November's pay, still
Mr. Annaji Rao drew
that month's pay in
full, simply request-
-ing the Comptroller
-if the 2nd December to
hold

hold the retrenchment order in abeyance, and without waiting for the latter officer's reply which was sent to him on the same day to the effect that as the orders of Government were peremptory the retrenchment directed could not be held in abeyance. ~~Upon hearing that Mr Annaji Rao~~ had drawn his full pay for November as above described, the Comptroller wrote to Mr. Annaji Rao blaming him for his action, and referring him to article 16, Chapter I of Vol I of the Civil Account Code, 5th Edition

Again when
~~After~~ December pay
became due, Mr Annaji
Rao addressed a Demi
official letter to the —
Chief Secretary to the
Dewan on the 11th Janu-
-ary 1893 (the Offices
having been closed
till the 9th idem on
account of the Christ-
mas holidays), re-
-questing that the
order for retrench-
-ment might be kept
in abeyance pending
orders on his represent-
-ation already made
to the Government —
through the Deputy
Commissioner. To this
he received a D.O.
reply

reply under orders

9 from the ~~Town~~ Govt. Dr. in the following terms:—

"-was, ~~that~~ The pro-

"-visions of clause 3,

"Rule 16 are clear and

"peremptory and there

"-fore, I am to request

"~~that~~ you will act at

"once according to

"the Comptrollers orders

"The orders of Govern-

"-ment on your represent-

"-ation will be com-

"-municated to you

"in due course and

"cannot be prejudiced

"by your complying with

"the Comptrollers re-

"-quisition in the case".

Even then, i.e.,

even under the orders

of Government com-

municated to him

X on what date?

through the Chief Secre-
-tary, Mr. Annaji Rao
drew full pay for the
month of December
about which the cor-
-respondence with
the Government took
place, so late as the
16th February 1893. He
has since, that is, on
the 1st March 1893, ~
written ~~to~~ D.O. to the
Chief Secretary that
he drew December's
pay for Ooparaya-
-ram expenses in his
house and stating
that "the pay of ~
"January is with the
"Government and he
"(the Comptroller) may
"credit it in the event
"of the Government not
allowing

On what date did he draw? in Jobs's up

11/

allowing the munici-
cipal allowance" &c.

It is clear from
the circumstances
above described that
Mr. Annaji Rao has not
only persistently dis-
-obeyed the orders of
the Comptroller but
also those of the Govern-
-ment communicated
to him by the Chief
Secretary under the
orders of the Hon. De-
-wan (~~Mr. Francis Chetty~~)
He has taken advant-
-age of the fact that
he is himself the Officer
in charge of the Banga-
-lore District Treasury,
and has drawn pay,
whenever he liked,
Contrary to Government

orders. Whatever his
representations might
be, there was no ex-
-cuse whatever for
his drawing his pay
for December directly
in opposition to the
orders of the Government,
as communicated to
him on the 16th Janu-
-ary 1893. He now
writes that his pay for
January and Febru-
-ary is at the disposal
of the Comptroller to
meet the charge should
the Government not
accede to his appli-
-cation for a recon-
-sideration of the
original order of re-
-fund. ~~But that is~~

of

13/

The fact that Mr. Annaji Rao has left two months pay un-drawn cannot be held to mean that he has complied with the order of the Govern-ment which was to the effect that a cer-tain amount was to be refunded to the Government, i.e., that the amount should be paid into the Treasury either in cash or by short drawals from his pay. Such pay-ment Mr. Annaji Rao has persistently abstained from making up

up to date. He could, if he really intended to comply with Govern-ment orders, have easily ascertained from the Comptroller the amount of refund he should make every month from his pay. He has on the contrary, evaded the payment on the excuse that a representation of his, submitted through the Deputy Commissioner, awaits the orders of the Government

Under such circumstances the Government cannot refrain from expressing their grave

grave displeasure at the conduct of Mr. Annaji Rao.

The Government also further direct that the amount in question i.e., Rs 451-9-10, should, under article 16, chapter I of Vol: I of the Civil Account Code, 5th Edition be refunded by Mr. Annaji Rao by monthly payments amounting to the whole of his pay until that amount is fully cleared. The Comptroller is request-ed to take immediate action upon this order.

Mr. Annaji Rao's representation

representation, submitted through the Deputy Commissioner regarding the correctness of the order of the 28th July 1892 will ~~receive~~ consideration later on, and orders passed thereon in due course.

Chief Secretary

To

The Comptroller

Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore Dt

for information

and communication

to Mr: Annaji Rao)

Jour 2816-

L 122

The Pr. ' ' 1

12 City Municip

1/2

To



The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of
Mysore

Dated 9th September 1892
Encls. 2

No. 83.

Recommending
that Mr Annaji Rao
may be exempted from
refunding the allowance
drawn by him during his
incumbency, as Vice President
of the Bangalore City Munic-
cipality

Lib 12
14/9

I never, so far as
I can remember,
gave my permission
to her husband
to draw the allowance.
Does this to the Dewan
to Recur of the case
given the permission —
If he did, of course
the order for ~~withdrawal~~ the
refund must be withdrawn —
If not, I see no reason
for modifying the order.

Lib 12 Connellan (Rev) Lep 14/9/92

The Dewan has

L & R
Mysore 9/9/92.

Rd 15/9 a. 30 P.M.
Ck

No recollection having commenced it either - He denies one & knows this for the Councillors impression & had however that if Mr Madras has on a matter fact understood Govt to accord such permission his testimony must be accepted.

Attd 12/12

The amt drawn by Mr Ismaji Pir & under objection is ~~Rs~~ 457-9-10 (being for the period from 16th Dec 1891 to 30th April 1892.)

Mr Vythyanatha Iyer also acted as V.P. from 18th Nov to 15 Dec & drew ~~Rs~~ 88-7-11 at ~~Rs~~ 100 per mensem - There has apparently been no objection about this - The reason is not evident).

Mr Puttanna Chetty was V.P upto 17 Nov 1891

Attd 25/1

Meanwhile the Mr Madhavarao has been absent & the Dewan seems to understand that the arrangement was to allow the allowance to accrue to the credit of the office, the arrears to be drawn by whoever officiates for the time being as decided by the Dewan.

Attd 4/2/93

He ~~was~~ directed to proceed to Ooty & report the receipt of Mr Arunachalam's letter & report it.

Attd 4/2/93

92/93

From

The President
City Munl. Comn.

To

The Chief Secretary
to the Govt. of Mysore

Dated 8th
Desped 9th September 92.

Enc: No 2

No 82

Sir.

With reference to Govt Proceedings No 1515-6/L-746-92 of 28th July last, I have the honor to forward herewith copy of letter from Mr. Annaji Rao together with copy of its enclosure in respect of the allowance drawn by him during his incumbency as Vice President and to state that as I have explained in my former

letter No. 68. 9 9th July 1892 it is heard on Mr. A. Rao to be now called on to refund the all he drew while doing Municipal work He the work as he and Mr Madhava Rao explain in the belief that he was entitled to the allowance. The Government, it is requested, may be pleased to make that the executive work of a large Municipality like the one at Bangalore, is not only a call on an Officer's time and attention which the Government may claim as theirs, but to a considerable extent a call on his purse also or at any rate it entails a deterioration in his property, horses and carriages. With all submission I beg to urge on the mercy of the Government the indivisability, if not the × unfairness of requiring a moderately paid Officer to refund an amount which in proportion to his pay is very large.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obdt. Servant

× unfair?
why?
too strong a word
for a Dy Comr
to use. MH
14/9/92

Mir Shujaat Ali
President
8th R

92/93

From

Wm M Annaji Rao

21

To

The Deputy Commr
and President
Bangalore

Section
File No
Serial No

Dated 31st August 92

Enclosure one

No 525.

Sir.

With reference to the Proc: of the Government of Mysore No 1515-6 L.J.46-92 of the 28th July last, a Copy of which was forwarded by you to me for refund of the Municipal Vice President allowance drawn by me, I beg to enclose a letter in original from Wm Madhava Rao on the subject and to

submit my own explanation in the matter for the consideration and orders of Govt.

I took charge of the District Treasury in December last from M. Vaidyanatha Iyer under orders of the Government. M. Madhava Rao, the then Deputy Comr. and President asked me to the duties of the Vice President in addition. I hesitated at first on the score that it would put me to additional cost and trouble. He however gave me to understand that he had consulted the Dewan and M. Chentsal Rao on the subject and that they both were not opposed to continue the allowance provided in the Budget. Hence I drew the allowance granted to me by the then Deputy Commissioner and President, M. Madhava Rao, with the belief that the Govt would not object to it. It will thus be seen that I simply acted in the matter under the orders of my official superior.

As it now appears that no formal sanction has been obtained for the same by the then President, I request you will kindly place the matter before Govt for its orders.

I have &c

One copy"

Sd/- M. Annaji Rao

I/c Thycaudali
President &c

Bangalore 29th August '92

93

My dear Annaji Rao.

I was very pained to see the orders of Government directing you to refund the monthly allowance of Rs 100/- entered in the Budget for the Vice President and drawn by you while doing the duties of President under my orders. I am sorry that the question was not referred to me before Government passed its orders.

It is true that under Government Pro: No. 5631-2 / 414 dt 11th August '91 the Office of Vice President was abolished. But the Govt, in their Pro: No. 7657-70 / 623 dt 6th October '91 in the course of passing orders on the Budget-Estimates of the Municipality for the year 1891/92 have, in para 5 of the Proceedings, ordered that the allowance for the Vice President which had been omitted

flown

from the estimates sent up by the G.C.
Board, should be inserted in the
Budget. It was subsequent to this
date, ie on the 18th November 1891
that Mr. Puttanna Chetty was
relieved of his Vice Presidentship
and Mr. Vedyanatha Iyer took
over charge from him. Mr. Vedya-
natha Iyer was subsequently
relieved by yourself. As there
was provision in the Budget
for allowance to the Vice President,
I thought it was the intention
of Govt that the Treasury Officer
who helped me in carrying on
the work of the Municipality
should be granted this allowance.

If I am not mistaken, the
fact of the allowance being
granted to the Officer doing duty
as Vice President was not un-
-known to the Govt. Further, so
far back as the 9th February 92
(vide docket No. 12651 & 1260 of 9/2/92 from
the Chief Secretary to the President

of the Municipality) Govt were aware of your doing the duties of Vice President - and when in subsequent Pro: No 13462/1363 of 24th Feby 92, the question of cash was raised, I as President of the Municipality in letter No 1078 of 29th Feby 92 represented that the allowance of Vice President should for reasons stated therein, be paid to the Officer doing duty under the orders of the President - Govt did not direct the discontinuance of the allowance in their order on the above letter, nor did they question the propriety of granting the allowance when passing their orders of the 26th May 1892.

They ordered the carrying out of Army Rules in Annexure as Vice-President as no such Office could exist under the [illegible]

The question of granting the allowance seems to have been raised for the first time in connection with the accounts of the Municipality for April 92 Vide docket No 5012/595 of 18th June 92 to the address of the President

feel that if the existance of a provision for an allowance to the Vice President had been pro = minently brought to the notice of Govt., they would have probably not ordered a refund. Considering that you were put to extra cost by having to do municipal work which was particularly heavy owing to my attention being directed during most of the time to Famine work, I think it rather hard that you should be called upon to refund the allowance drawn I should not have minded the order if it had been passed in the case of a high placed Official But it comes very hard on a poorly paid Officer like yourself I am really sorry that I did not obtain the formal sanction of Govt. to the disbursement to you and Mr. Vidyanatha Iyer

of

allowance for such provision had been made in the Budget.

2) I am sure that if you make an appeal to Government through the Deputy Commissioner, they may be disposed to take a more considerate view of your case

Believe me

Yours Sincerely
Sd/ V.P. Madhavarao

Copy
B.G.

Sri Thyagaraja
President

Abstract Dept 2072

(General Serial No. 30)

28

1892.

From

Confidential

To M. Annaji Rao Esq.

Urgent

Section [illegible]

Dated 28th

Despatched 29 Nov.

Sera. No

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 2797

No.

With reference to para 2 of Govt. Pro: No 1515. 6. & 7 46. 92 d/28th July/92, directing that the allowance drawn by him as Vice President of the Bangalore City Municipality be forthwith refunded, has the honor to enquire whether he has refunded the amt: in obedience thereto, & if so to furnish a Certificate to that effect to this Office, & therein to deduct the same by short drawal from the pay bill for the current month

M C

Reply rec'd 2nd Dec. 1892

No. 2

Copy forwarded
Comm: Dy Deptt Barg
with the intimation beg
before cashing the Paybill of
Annaji Rao for the current
it may be ascertained
Certificate called for has been
furnished, if not the pension due
and drawn by him should be
deducted from his Paybill
to the Bangalore City
in his Jaghir in addition only.

28/4/92

Forwarded for orders

1761

Bangalore, 29th Augt '92

My dear Annaji Row

I was very pained to see the orders of Government directing you to refund the monthly allowance of Rs 100/- entered in the Budget for the Vice President and drawn by you while doing the duties of President under my orders. I am sorry that the question was not referred to me before Govt passed its orders.

It is true that under Govt Pro No 5631-L 414 dated 11th August 1891, the Office of Vice President was abolished. But the Govt, in their Prop. No 7657-70 L. 623 dated 6th Oct. 1891 in the course of passing orders on the Budget estimates of the Municipality for the year 1891-92 have, in para 5 of the Proceedings, ordered that the allowance for the Vice Presidt which had been omitted from the estimates sent up by the Board, should be inserted in the Budget. It was subsequent to this date, ie, on the 18th Novr 1891, that Mr Puttanna Chetty was relieved of his Vice Presidentship and Mr Vaidyanatha Iyer took over charge from him. Mr Vaidyanatha Iyer was subsequently relieved by yourself. As there was provision in the Budget for allowance to the Vice Pres I thought it was the intention of Govt that the Treasury Officer who helped me in carrying on the work of the Municy

should be granted this allowance.

If I am not mistaken, the fact of the allowance being granted to the Officer doing duty as Vice President was not unknown to the Govt. Further, so far back as the 9th February 1892 (vide Docket No. 12651 L 1260 dated 9th Febry 892 from the Chief Secretary, to the President of the Municipality) Govt were aware of your doing the duties of Vice Presdt. and when in subsequent Progs No. 13462 L 1363 of 24th February, 1892, the question of cost was raised, I, as President of the Municipality, in letter No. 1078 dated 29th Feb. 92 represented that the allowance of Vice President should, for reasons stated therein, be paid to the Officer doing duty under the orders of the President. Govt did not direct the discontinuance of the allowance in their order on the above letter, nor did they question the propriety of granting the allowance when passing their orders of the 26th May 892.

The question of granting the allowance seems to have been raised for the first time in Connection with the accounts of the Municipality for April 892 # vide Docket No. 5012 L 595

P7

dated 18th June 1892 to the address of the President. I feel that if the existence of a provision for an allowance to the Vice President had been prominently brought to the notice of Govt, they would have probably not ordered a refund. Considering that you were put to extra cost by having to do Municipal work which was particularly heavy owing to my attention being directed during most of the time to Famine work, I think it rather hard that you should be called upon to refund the allowance drawn. I should not have minded the order if it had been passed in the case of a high placed official. But it comes very hard on a poorly paid officer like yourself. I am really sorry that I did not obtain the formal sanction of Government to the disbursement to you and Mr Venkatanatha Iyer of the allowance for which provision had been made in the Budget.

I am sure, that if you make an appeal to Government through the Deputy Comm^r, they may be disposed to take a more considerate view of your case.

Believe me.
Yours sincerely
(Sd) V. D. Madhavarao

Copy
(Sd) Mir Shujaat Ali
Pres^d

33

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892

From The comptroller

OFFICE OF
6178
12 DEC. 92
G2763

To The Chief Secretary to the Treasury

Dated 10th
Despatched 12th } December
Received

Enclosures No. 5

General No. 64.
No 4

Stating that Mr. Smyth now assistant commissioner in charge of the Brisbane District Treasury failed to carry out the instructions in connection with retrenchment made by this office and requesting to impress upon the Treasury officers the fact that they should strictly carry out the principle laid down in article 16 referred to.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient
humble servant
[illegible]
Comptroller

12/12/92

Send them for the orders of the Treasurer. I think the fact Mr Smyth seems to have carried out the instructions of the comptroller, & his failure to do so, is inconsistent with the standing orders & all notions of discipline.

[illegible]
4/2193

Acting Chief Secretary

J. H. Boyce
4627-8
1746-92

34

COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE
10 DEC. 92
MYSORE.

No. 642 / 27 Encls Nos 5

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF MYSORE,

Bangalore, 10/12 December 189-

From

~~A. RANGASWAMI IYENGAR, Esq~~,

The Comptroller of Mysore.

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

SIR,

I have the honor in forwarding for such orders as the Government may deem fit to pass the correspondence (in original) that has taken place between myself and Mr. M. Annaji Row, Assistant Commissioner in charge of the Bangalore District Treasury, in connection with the refund of the allowance directed in para 2 of Government Proceedings No. 1515-6 / 2746-92 dated 28th July 1892, to state that Mr Annaji Row's conduct is highly reprehensible, inasmuch as he should have awaited a reply to his letter of the 2nd Instant, requesting that the retrenchment order may be held in abeyance till the orders of Government had been obtained to the reference said to have been made on his behalf by the Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore and that no Treasury Officer he should have been

} to be obliging by returned

No. 2797 dated 28th November 1892 to Mr Annaji's
" 205 dated 2nd December 1892 from —Do—
" 587 dated 2nd December 1892 to —Do—
" 210 dated 3rd December 1892 from —Do—
" 627 dated 6th December 1892 to —Do—

been perfectly aware that he is expected under article 16 of Chapter I of Volume I of the Civil Account Code 2nd edition to carry out the instructions issued by this office, in regard to retrenchments.

35

I regret to state that Mr Annaji Row has not only in this instance failed to carry out the instructions issued by me, but also in that regarding the recovery of Rs 451-9-9 from the pay of Mr Mir Shujayet Ali Khan for November 1892 the allowance drawn by him as President of the Bangalore City Municipality

I respectfully beg that Government may with the view of preventing such a recurrence, impress upon Treasury Officers the fact that they should strictly carry out the principle laid down in Article 16 referred to above, as without which I cannot be held responsible for carrying out any instructions that may be issued by Government if Treasury Officers who are subordinate to the Comptroller be allowed to ignore the instructions issued by him

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
[signature]
For Comptroller

Comptroller's Office No 20

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892. 26

From The Comptroller

(36)

To Mr. Finnegan & Co
Dry Offr's Bangalore

Dated 6
Despatched 7 Dec 1892
Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 627
No

His docket No 210 dated 3rd Instant stating that he has drawn his pay for November 1892 in full and he is prepared to refund the amount should the Govt. direct the Comptroller's decision —

In reply to the above has the honor to state that he has drawn his pay for Nov 1892 in Contravention to the Office docket No 587 dated 2nd Instant. He is requested to return

(20)

the amount above
under Article 16
C. A. Code 5th Ed.

A refund of the amount
may be claimed should
Govt reverse their
decision.

For Comptroller

P.S.

Comptroller's office 238

(General Serial No 30)

1892.93

38

From The Treasury Officer

COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE
5-DEC.92
MYSORE

Bangalore Division

To The Comptroller of

Mysore

Dated 3rd December 1892

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 210

No.

His No. 587 of 2nd

instant

In reply has the honour to state that after addressing him on the subject he has drawn his pay for November 92 in full. The undersigned is prepared to refund the amount should the Government, before whom the question is pending settlement affirm the

Ref. to 10627 of 1892
27.

the original decision

H. Ramaiah

Treasury Officer

Bangalore District

H.R.

Comptroller's Office Dec. 17

(General Serial No. 30)

1892.

From

Cantonment

To

M. Cumaji Das Esqr.

Dy Mr. Bengalee

Dated 2nd

Despatched 3 Decr.

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 587

No.

Dated 2/10 dd 3/12/92

In reply to his No 205 of this date has the honor to state that as the orders of Govt. were peremptory, the punishment directed cannot be held in abeyance till the orders of Govt. are obtained on the reference said to be made by the Dy. Commr.

for 2/12/92

Comptroller's office L 7

(General Serial No. 30) 6

(4)

COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE
1892-93
2 DEC 92
MYSORE

From The Treasury Officer
Bangalore District

To The Comptroller of
Mysore

Dated 2nd December 1892

Despatched 2nd

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 205

No.

Endorsed No 487 of 2/12/92 - Peer

His No 2797 of 28
ultimo

In reply to the above
has the honour to state
that on receipt of the
Government Proceeding
relating to the refund
to Municipal Vice
Presidents' allowance
drawn by him the
undersigned represented
the circumstances in
which he drew the
allowan

allowance in a letter to the Deputy Commissioner the 31st August 1892 with a request to submit the matter for the reconsideration and orders of the Government (12)

As the papers are still before Government, the undersigned respectfully requests that the retrenchment Order may be held in abeyance.

M Ramaiah

Treasury Officer
Bangalore District

29

Read:

Letter No 642/L7 dated 10th December 1892 from the Comptroller to Mysore Government bringing to notice of Government that Mr. M. Annaji Row Assistant Commissioner in charge of the District Treasury Bangalore, failed to carry out the instructions contained in para 2 of Proceedings No 1575-16/L7 46-92 of 28th July 1892 in connection with the refund of the allowance drawn by him and requesting that Govt:



Rf 601

4627-8/L7.46-92 29/9/93

From Comptroller
To 2970.93 L959

may with a view of
preventing such a
recurrance impress
upon the Treasury
Officers the principle
laid down in Art 16
of Chapter I of Vol I of
the Civil Account-
Code 5th Edition

4627-8 9/12/94
L 7 46 — 92

Order thereon:

The Comptroller
will be instructed
to carry out the
order for refund
and if two months
pay is due the
adjustment of the

As appears the
case from
A.D.C. Presentation
Ref from Mr. Annapolis
None

refund may be
effected therefrom at once.

Draft- [signature]
Chief Secretary

To,

The Comptroller to
Mysore Govt:

Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore Dt:
(for information
and Communi-
-cation to his
Annual Rent)

Bangalore,
13th Feb. 93.

My dear Sir,

Adverting to your letter dated 29th August last to Mr Annaji Row (Assistant Commissioner) on the subject of the Municipal allowance drawn by him which is now under objection I am directed to ask whether the Dewan gave you to understand that Mr

Annaji Ram will be allowed to draw the allowance

The Hon'ble Mr. Chunilal Ram never, as far as he can remember, gave his permission to Mr Annaji Ram drawing the allowance, nor does the Diwan remember having done so. But if, as a matter of fact,

you understood Government
to accord such permission
your statement has of
Course to be accepted

I am
Yours sincerely
P Mandalam

V. P. Madhava Row Esq

My dear Sir.

I shall feel obl[iged]
by the letter or
being sent to me for
reference

I am
dear Sir
yours sincerely
M. B. Madhava Rao
22nd Feby 93
Mysore

My dear Sir! Send the

Copy herewith as
desired - & note
this may help in
your note book as
you may like to
have reference -

Yrs Sincerely

F Mandeville

W. Madison Rundy

My dear Sir

Allow me to

Herewith Copy of
letter to Mr Annag
Rao kindly send
her you for reference
I do not say in it
that either the Hon'ble Mr Chenchiah
or the Dewan Bahadur
their permission to
Annaya Rao draw
the allowance now
I remember that the
ever did so, nor
Can I say that

fact, I understood
Govt Daccord
such permission"

I have nothing more
to say on this point
than what is
contained in my
letter to Mr Lamy
now.

Believe me
My dear Sir
Yours truly
H Broadhead

(General Serial No. 30.)

30

189 3 6955-

From The comptr. Mr. 11 L-95-9

To The Chief secretary to the Dewan of mysore

Section Jounl
No 11-21
Serial No 28

Dated 4th 287-9 & 4-11-93 L-7-46-92

Despatched 8th October,

Received 11

Enclosures No.

General No. 702
No. (27

To the Same &c

Reporting that the Treasury Offr in Bangalore has intimated that the recovery of Rs 457-9-10 from Mr A Anonymous Row, has been made and credited the same to the A/cs of the Bangalore city Municipality

H. Good Bye

H moor Please send the file
GRJ 19/10/93

No. 702
L 43.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF MYSORE,
Bangalore, 7th October 1893.

From

E. R. SUBBRAYAR, Esq.,
Comptroller of Mysore,

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

SIR,

With reference to Government Proceedings No 4627-8 L 7-46-92 of 9th September 1893, I have the honor to report for the information of Government that the Officer in charge of the Bangalore District Treasury, has intimated to that Office, the recovery of the sum of Rupees 457-9-10 from Mr Ameerkhan, and the credit of the same to the funds of the Bangalore City Municipality.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant

Comptroller

Ch

(49)

Read: —

Letter dated 7th October 1893, No. 702 L. F. from the Comptroller of Mysore, reporting that, with reference to Govt. Pro: No. 4627-8 L. F. 46-92 Dated 9th September 1893, a sum of Rs. 451-9-10 was recovered from Mr. Armage Row and that the same was credited to the funds of the Bangalore City Municipality. —



GR L 1171

No. 8528-9 dt 28/11/93
L. F. 46-92

Order thereon

Recorded.

W.
For Chief Secy.

Secy
28/11

To, The Comptroller of Mysore & President of the Bangalore City Municipality

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

From

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.
No.